1

34

5

6

7

9

8

10

11

12

13 14

1516

17

18 19

2021

22

23

2425

2627

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

Tamika Lockett,

Plaintiff.

v.

Namaste Apartments, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01779-RFB-DJA

Order

Pro se Plaintiff Tamika Lockett filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF No. 1). However, Plaintiff's application is missing certain information. The Court thus denies Plaintiff's application without prejudice.

## I. <u>Discussion</u>.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), a plaintiff may bring a civil action "without prepayment of fees or security therefor" if the plaintiff submits a financial affidavit that demonstrates the plaintiff "is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor." The Ninth Circuit has recognized that "there is no formula set forth by statute, regulation, or case law to determine when someone is poor enough to earn [in forma pauperis] status." Escobedo v. Applebees, 787 F.3d 1226, 1235 (9th Cir. 2015). An applicant need not be destitute to qualify for a waiver of costs and fees, but he must demonstrate that because of his poverty he cannot pay those costs and still provide himself with the necessities of life. Adkins v. E.I DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948).

The applicant's affidavit must state the facts regarding the individual's poverty "with some particularity, definiteness and certainty." *United States v. McQuade*, 647 F.2d 938, 940 (9th Cir. 1981) (citation omitted). If an individual is unable or unwilling to verify his or her poverty, district courts have the discretion to make a factual inquiry into a plaintiff's financial status and to deny a request to proceed *in forma pauperis*. *See, e.g., Marin v. Hahn*, 271

10

13 14

15

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

26

25

27

Fed.Appx. 578 (9th Cir. 2008) (finding that the district court did not abuse its discretion by denying the plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis because he "failed to verify his poverty adequately"). "Such affidavit must include a complete statement of the plaintiff's personal assets." Harper v. San Diego City Admin. Bldg., No. 16-cv-00768 AJB (BLM), 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 192145, at \*1 (S.D. Cal. June 9, 2016). Misrepresentation of assets is sufficient grounds for denying an in forma pauperis application. Cf. Kennedy v. Huibregtse, 831 F.3d 441, 443-44 (7th Cir. 2016) (affirming dismissal with prejudice after litigant misrepresented assets on in forma pauperis application).

On her application, Plaintiff responds to question 2 by stating her gross and take-home wages, but Plaintiff does not provide her employer's name and address. She also does not identify if she makes income from any other source other than "[b]usiness, profession, or other self-employment" in response to question 3 and does not describe "the amount that you received and what you expect to receive in the future." Plaintiff has left questions 5 and 7 blank without any explanation about whether or not they apply to her. She also lists the Department of Education as a financial obligation in response to question 8, but does not "describe the amounts owed." The Court finds that Plaintiff has omitted information from the application. As a result, the Court cannot determine whether Plaintiff qualifies for in forma pauperis status.

The Court will give Plaintiff one opportunity to file a complete in forma pauperis application. The Court further orders that Plaintiff may not respond with a zero or "not applicable" in response to any question without providing an explanation for each of the questions. Plaintiff also may not leave any questions blank. Plaintiff must describe each source of money that she receives, state the amount she received, and what she expects to receive in the future.

The Court denies Plaintiff's in forma pauperis application without prejudice. The Court gives Plaintiff 30 days to file an updated application. Plaintiff must fully answer all applicable questions and check all applicable boxes. Plaintiff may alternatively pay the filing fee in full. Since the Court denies Plaintiff's application, it does not screen the complaint at this time.

Additionally, Plaintiff's mail has been returned as undeliverable. (ECF No. 4). Under Nevada Local Rule IA 3-1.

> An attorney or pro se party must immediately file with the court written notification of any change of mailing address, email address, telephone number, or facsimile number. The notification must include proof of service on each opposing party or the party's attorney. Failure to comply with this rule may result in the dismissal of the action, entry of default judgment, or other sanctions as deemed appropriate by the court.

The Court will thus require Plaintiff to update her address.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 1) is denied without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff has until December 4, 2024, to file an updated application to proceed in forma pauperis as specified in this order or pay the filing fee. Failure to timely comply with this order may result in a recommendation to the district

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is kindly directed to send Plaintiff a copy of this order and of the Short Form application to proceed in forma pauperis and its

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff has until December 4, 2024, to update her address. Failure to timely comply with this order may result in a recommendation to the district judge that this case be dismissed.

DATED: November 4, 2024

DANIEL J. ALBREGTS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

26

24

25

27

28

<sup>1</sup> This form and its instructions can also be found at https://www.nvd.uscourts.gov/courtinformation/forms/ under Code AO 240.